

**Section B: Report of July 7, 2004 Staff Focus Group
Wisconsin DNR Waste Management Program**

Wausau State Patrol Headquarters
Bert Stitt – facilitator, Susan Puntillo – note taker

I. Check-In Round*: What are your expectations for this meeting?

No Expectations

- I have no expectations
- I have no expectations.

Uncertainty

- I'm not sure – we have gone through this before – I want to find out how other people feel about what is going on with them
- I did not know what we would be talking about - I have not been tracking the redesign issue - due to being at risk thought I might not be here today - I hope something good might come out of today's meeting

Desire to Learn More

- I was at risk of lay off and have not been paying a lot of attention. This is an opportunity to find out more
- I want to learn a little more about redesign. We need to change the program because of large number of cuts and the long period of time since we have looked at what we do and how we do it.

Desire for Productivity

- I have a lot of gripes that I want to turn into something constructive
- I'm aware there are some problems and hopefully we can address some of them in the program and in the Department.

Skeptical

- I'm ambivalent - is this worth going through?
- I want to give input on redesign process and hopefully have some level of trust what we say will be heard and not used against us
- I want to discuss meaningful ideas for redesign, I think ... management (substitute for specific name) already has preconceived ideas - hope we can have some input

Sense of Futility

- If past is a predictor of future, this is a complete waste of time for the Department and this program in particular. Management isn't open or responsive to staff input. Maybe there will be change, but I'm not overly confident.

* Please see Appendix B for a complete description of the "Round" process.

II. Introduction by Deb Pingel

Why are we here?

- (Based on) things ... (management) had heard about program – (Felt a) need to take control rather than (have it directed by) externals
- Internal – we have too many sections – need to reflect reduced staffing
- We have one year – through 1/2005 to make recommendations
- For people that did not come today – this is an open process, use web site, personal issues may not show up on web, but issues need to be brought out
- Send things to Bert, on paper, keep anonymous whatever they want/need
- Why one year – take control and manage, catch budget cycle

III. Participant Questions/Comments about “Why We Are Here”:

- Is there more weight on the external comments?
- Can we put all the comments together?
- Who the redesign team met with first reflects who is framing the process.
- (Is there a) Predetermined outcome?
- Why has a particular external individual been allowed multiple opportunities to give input?

Deb Pingel's Response:

- ... (Focus Groups were held) with externals first so staff could respond to their concerns if staff wanted to.
- We need to address the externals' concerns.
- Minutes from design meetings will be posted and will send staff a reminder.

IV. Facilitator Comments/Teachings Based on Opening Expectations and Questions:

- *As individuals in an institution, personal growth and capacity building, and awareness of your own buttons/triggers and constantly monitoring those triggers are important skill areas to develop.*
- *I am struck by the underlying sense of futility that seems to permeate the check-in and introductory comments.*
- *I am also struck by the one expression of a desire for turning gripes to productive energy.*
- *Energy can be positive or negative – it is your personal choice*
- *You can only work with what you have control of.*
- *In a government institution you have control of little, other than yourself.*

- *Be aware of how you use your energy. You will have more influence on any situation if you can think like that.*
- *You have been given a positive leadership intention, with positive qualities to get in front of the ball.*
- *Help your leadership to get in front of the ball.*
- *The best leaders look for good work in the people they are leading and support that good work.*
- *When leadership wants people to be involved in decision-making it is important that they consult with them as to how they want to be involved. This process apparently could have been improved by more thoroughly engaging staff in a discussion of the focus group scheduling part of the process.*
- *Seemingly small missteps on the front end can create big issues later.*

Acknowledgements:

People don't like it when they cannot see what is being recorded (A comment on the fact that the recorder was taking notes on a computer without the benefit of a view screen for the participants).

Basic Themes in the discussion so far:

Futility

Energy shift choices

Proactive redesign

Process

V. The group considered:

“Should we review the externals’ comments now, or later in this session?”

- Opening Comment: “Maybe we should not focus on them. Because it turns our effort to focusing on their concerns and giving them more importance. We should be focusing on what we think needs addressing.”
- Round:
 - talk about our stuff first
 - talk about our stuff
 - questions first
 - don't care
 - pass
 - our stuff
 - our stuff
 - not their stuff
 - pass
 - our stuff, and anonymous makes things less important
 - our stuff
 - our stuff

The decision was made to change the agenda to consider staff focus group considerations first.

VI. Round: Questions about the presence in this staff focus group of a former Waste Program Manager:

- Why (did he) not ... (attend) managers meeting
- Don't care
- Can stay
- Can stay
- Glad he is here
- Don't care
- Look forward to hear(ing what he has to say)
- Stay
- Stay
- Welcome to stay,
- OK
- OK
- Surprised he was the only ex-manager that showed. Knows that others were invited.

VII. Question: Will redesign team members be part of the managers meeting?

The group felt that redesign team members should not be at the managers' meeting.

(I am not sure of the "group" reference here. Should it read, "The participants of the staff focus group felt...." or "the redesign team felt ..." or is there some other reference here?) Bert Stitt

Facilitator: Ultimately, ... (It will improve the chances for success) to have everyone in the room at the same time to discuss issues with each other. It is unlikely that you will resolve issues unless you are willing to be in the room with people you do not trust. You do not resolve things by meeting separately unless you have a neutral third party mediating between the groups...

VIII. Questions and comments the group hopes will be answered and/ or acknowledged by the redesign team or others:

Timelines/Boundaries/usefulness

- A. Why haven't we addressed our internal structure before now, given loss of staff and resources?
- B. We just went through reorg in 1997. Why didn't they fix things then if structure is ineffective? We are wasting time and money disrupting people again.
- C. What are the sideboards? Limitations or boundaries

- D. Why have we selected sideboards that restrict our ability to end up with a better functioning program?
- E. Is there going to be an analysis of work we do? Why we do it? What things are most important to continue doing? What can we change in how we do?

Parity with Externals

- A. Are we going to be able to give externals feedback?
- B. Are they going to see our comments and give us feedback?
- C. If they want us to respond to their concerns, then they should be willing to respond to our concerns.
- D. Why were individuals given personal audiences with the redesign team?

Staff Input and Predetermined Outcomes

- A. What do we, as staff, see as problems that need to be fixed?
- B. There is intent and/or expectation on the part of some managers that there will be some things that will be implemented prior to the redesign process. Why is that? List of actions to be taken right away.
- C. Why is there a predetermined conclusion that we need to be more like the air and R&R program? Makes it sound like we have not done anything good in our program.
- D. There appears to be some assessment or conclusion that the programs are similar and that copying the programs is appropriate.
- E. Original redesign team had no staff on it. Why did we have to fight to have staff on the team? Another sign that staff input is not valued.

Clarity

- A. Why are they being cryptic with design change discussions? They want “cultural change”, but will not come out and say what that is. They use buzz words – get rid of them & speak clearly. Don’t hide behind flowery language that is meaningless.
- B. Is there intent to change our statutes and basic requirements of our program?
- C. More opacity in the transparency.

Facilitator comments

- *These are good questions. They are instructive and deep, and tap into root causes.*
- *Questions are important. How they are framed makes all the difference.*
- *You can’t manage the process until you know all of the pieces*

- *Problem solving is rather negative – puzzle solving is a more positive way to put it (- and “discovering what works” is even better.)*
- *Be careful with language - the words and the tone we use can prejudice , enhance, help or hurt our discussions*
- *We benefit from paying attention to what we say and the way we say it if we want to positively address the situational dynamic and influence the outcome productively.*
- *Using your energy positively puts you on a hill from which you can launch your ideas and initiatives vs. using your energy negatively which puts you in a hole that you then have to climb out of.*

Participant Comments:

Question 5 (“What are some things that are still part of statutes and no longer work, but which have never been changed?”) This question gets to what we do - defined by statutes and interpretation of statutes – there are things that consume a lot of time and are not productive. If people are looking at the program to make changes – statutory changes are practical.

Question number 4 (“How will you judge if we are successful: – What do you consider a successful Waste Program? – What do you think industry would consider a successful program? – What do you think environmentalists would consider a successful program?”) This is a profound and appropriate question set.

IX. Appreciative Inquiry Principles*:

The facilitator introduced the “Appreciative Inquiry” model as a current methodology with improved techniques for the group reviewed the questions on the handout about “Appreciative Inquiry Principles”. *We need to deal with group stuff or they will not be ready to deal with the other stuff*

Facilitator:

- *DNR’s obligation is driven by responding to their constituency; the public: “The, public elects officials, we are obligated to respond to the legislature. Another constituency is also the environment itself.*
- *Each party in any dispute is looking for comfort.*
- *Appreciative Inquiry suggests that if we can figure out when stuff works and why it works and then reapply it in other situations, we will have a better chance of successfully sorting out the complexities (issues) in our work/dispute.*
- *It will help to talk about positive experiences – you have not spent your entire careers in the pits of hell.*
- *Learning about each other’s personal values before you discuss issues will help to bring mutual understanding to the situation. Leadership and staff will benefit from doing this sincerely, deeply, and completely.*

Participant:

- Facilitator's use of the term bureau in redesign discussion is incorrect – bureau refers to central office – effort is to look at the whole program state-wide.

Round: Reflections on ways to ask questions, nature of questions, and language of questions:

- Use the term “waste management program” instead of “bureau.”
- Need to think about it.
- Either one of the sets of questions provides a framework for moving forward.
- Anxious to move along.
- How you ask helps frame of mind.
- Being on a hill is better than being in a hole.
- Get on with answering the questions.

X. Program Re-design Brainstorming:

The following section reflects posted sticky notes organized into themes with dots for indicating those themes which the participants felt, if skillfully handled, would make everything else that is undertaken likely to be more successful

After posting all the comments on the wall, the group organized them into themes. The bold titles below are the themes. After grouping the comments under themes, each individual voted for the most important themes that he/she hoped the Redesign would address.

THE QUESTION(S) -

- **HOW WILL YOU JUDGE IF THE REDESIGN IS SUCCESSFUL?
AND**
- **WHAT WILL A SUCCESSFUL REDESIGN LOOK LIKE?**

Re-Phrased

- **WHAT ARE YOUR HOPES AND WISHES FOR A HEALTHY AND VITAL REDESIGN PROCESS AND PRODUCT?**

**No
of
Dots Focus Theme**

- 10 (BETTER) MANAGEMENT > TECHNICAL CAPABILITY (OF STAFF IS) ACKNOWLEDGED**
- ... management ... appreciate(s) expertise and experience of field staff
 - Internal technical reviews for consistency are recentralized (also suggested to be under healing wounds)
 - Technical staff ... report(s) to technical supervisors (also suggested to be under healing wounds)
 - A policy section chief that has a working knowledge of the program and is a leader not just a yes-... (person).
- 9 (WE HAVE) EFFECTIVE STAFFING RESOURCES (AND STRUCTURE)**
- Reduced management, increased staff support personnel
 - Management to staff ratio is 1:6
 - ... (we have) support staff so tech staff can do tech work
 - Professional staff (are) in positions ... (where) they can meaningfully contribute and are happy
 - Effective and ... efficient use of resources on a state-wide basis
 - Redeployment of resources toward development and use of IT tools to further program mission, enhance productivity, make program actions more transparent
 - I wish to be provided with the tools to do my job efficiently, effectively and for the benefit of all
 - Restructure program to address:
 - a. Supervisor to staff ratio
 - b. Provide technical supervision to technical staff
 - c. Enhance interaction of staff with similar responsibilities
- 8 RESPONSE TO (EXTERNAL) CONCERNS**
- Identify the most important ideas we want (to work on) and try to influence them (as opposed to trying to hold on to everything)
 - Environmentally minded/good steward businesses and practices are rewarded
 - Innovative processes provide positive environmental impact, not just more profit for business
 - Initiate measured responses to industry concerns, while maintaining program integrity
 - ... (we are) open to all parties and identify where change is possible and where it ... (will) require legislative change
 - Organic recovery and renewable energy are encouraged/fostered

6 ACCOUNTABILITY

- I wish that accountability be incorporated into the structure
- Management (is) involved and accountable for/with staff performance

6 STAFF DEVELOPMENT

- Technical staff opinions ... (will) be respected
- We retain qualified staff and redirect staff who are bored or not working up to their potential

5 (OPENNESS / TRANSPARENCY / COOPERATION) - TRUST

- Bring all parties together to have an open and honest exchange of ideas – perhaps even a debate
- ... (we) make a sincere effort to bring all parties to the table to participate in the process
- (we) foster open communication among staff and managers/clarify management's understanding of program operations

5 FAIR AND OBJECTIVE PROCESS FOR REDESIGN

- I wish (that) we ... approach the redesign scientifically and objectively
- I wish that we ... make sure that **all** key externals are invited to participate e.g. – EPA R5, UW- Extension, SHWEC
- I wish that we ... consider what has and hasn't worked for other Midwestern state waste management programs
- (we) put some weight on comments rather than have a few comments (individuals) drive the process
- (we have) buy-in by all involved parties even if it ... (is) agreeing to disagree

5 STEWARDSHIP/PROTECT ENVIRONMENT AND INDIVIDUALS

- (we have) a functional program that protects public health and the environment, minimizing risks both now and in the future, while ensuring adequate capabilities to manage the state's waste
- ... the little people can still get service/response from DNR
- I ... (hope that) the Department. ... will be more forceful in responding to detractors in the legislature
- (I hope) that the push for recycling and zero waste doesn't become justification for massive pollution, esp. PBTs

3 THE RIGHT PEOPLE

- Redesign group ... will be 1/3 management, 1/3 technical staff, 1/3 support staff plus 1-2 from outside the program
- Put the right people in charge of organizing the approach for the redesign
- The right people for the redesign should not include (named individual)
- Better balance among managers, staff, team leaders
- Bureau Director ... (will) not chair the redesign, rather ... (will) facilitate/shepherd the process
- (we will) have an x-section of environmentalists/academic/managers/staff/business/etc
- Right: more staff, not right: policy section chief
- (we will have) more involvement of field staff and representation from each major staff category of staff positions
- (the) people ... (who will) be in charge of design (will be the) solid waste team

2 BETTER RELATIONSHIPS

- That management/administration can gain the trust of staff
- Central office vs. regional power struggle ... (will) evolve into a productive partnership
- ... the animosity between staff and administration ... (will) go away so we can move on
- (we will have) a redesign in which staff members (will have) felt they had sufficient input
- (we will) reduce or eliminate divisions caused by dispersal of staff

2 RESPECT

- ... Rely on staff review decisions more so than... (management) has in the past
- (we will have) program leaders that are professional and competent
- (we will) return waste program to its previous stature as a leader

2 EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION

- (we will) Initiate a coordinated effort to get out the message of program efforts and trends in waste management in WI
- (We will understand) what is really meant by proactive?

1 BUDGET

- ... (we will) have the necessary budget to pay for innovation processes

0 MAINTAIN AND IMPROVE TECHNICAL EXPERTISE BY SHARING INFO

- Technical staff (will have) more interaction
- (we will have) much closer communication or discussion between staff on projects and technical review

0 REEXAMINE PAST

- (we will) be open to re-implementing things that worked in the past that we dropped in 1996

XI. Healing the Wounds of the Past:

The following section reflects posted sticky notes organized into themes with dots for indicating those themes which the participants felt, if skillfully handled, would make everything else that is undertaken to heal the wounds of the past likely to be more successful

THE QUESTION(S) -

- **WHAT WILL SUCCESS LOOK LIKE IN HEALING THE WOUNDS OF THE PAST? And**
- **WHAT THREE WISHES WOULD YOU MAKE TO HEIGHTEN THE VITALITY AND HEALTH OF THE PROCESS IN DEALING WITH THE WOUNDS OF THE PAST?**

Dots Focus Theme

5 OPEN AND HONEST COMMUNICATION

- (we will have) open and honest dialogue from the beginning
- (we will have) honest communication from management
- (we will have) better communication between staff and administration
- (we will) be more honest and direct
- ... (we will have a) management structure that results ... (in being) more open and honest
- (we will have) acknowledgement by management of what worked and what did not work

5 STAFF INPUT

- Management ... (will) listen to staff concerns and ideas and implement them
- Management gives consideration to staff input
- (we will) resolve (the) appearance that staff input to management decision and redesign process are marginalized
- ... (we will) place more importance on internal input from staff – give staff a more equal voice in the process
- Management ... (will) really hear and listen to staff input
- More staff input (will be) encouraged by management
- (we will) allow staff to be involved early in the design stage

3 FAIR AND EQUAL STAKEHOLDER INPUT

- (there will be) less influence by ... (particular) groups of stakeholders which have the most to gain by reducing regulation
- (there will be) equal input from all affected parties... staff, industry, citizens, environmental groups, the environment
- (we will) resolve (the) appearance that select externals are driving direction of redesign process
- ... consumers of the environment/stakeholders (will) include (a) cross-section of food industry
- Management ... (will) follow a direction that benefits all citizens of this state

2 CLEAR DIRECTIONS

- (we will) resolve (the) appearance that (the) state's citizens and environment have only secondary consideration in program operations and redesign
- (we will) be more specific about what management wants to do
- (we will have) a government directed by something more than a perception of democracy

0 MANAGEMENT LEADERSHIP INVOLVEMENTS

- ... management will (become) more efficient in staffing and in budgeting
- ... managers ... (will) be more involved with field level work re: do some field level work
- (We will have) managers that are leaders. To a great degree I believe we have that, but not enough

LUNCH BREAK

XII. Round: Status Check on how are we doing at this point in this meeting?

- Satisfied
- (It's Helping) us deal with baggage issues – reason for slow start
- Still have some gripes
- Not enough done
- Longer more significant comments
- Getting people's thoughts and issues
- Not lots of risk so style worked
- What will the product be
- Meeting expectations
- *Go slow to go fast*
- Have a start so lets add to it

XIII Discussion Regarding Review of External Comments:

- It's hard to discuss these comments because we do not know who made them and they are out of context.
- We ... (have not had the opportunity) to discuss how to use this information meaningfully.
- We ... (do not have an adequate approach to coordinating) ... internal and external input.
- What really is meant by a "change management program"?
- "Cultural change" is just a nonsense phrase. Define it.
- We (do not have) details and specifics.

XIV. EXTERNAL COMMENTS

This section contains the dot voting on the external comments –
Key: red = disagree, yellow = needs clarification, green = agree.
Staff feels that Red and Yellow items should go back to the externals for further discussion and clarification.

They are arranged such that the first take includes all statements with all the dot assignments. Then they are displayed by those receiving only green dots then those receiving only yellow dots and finally those receiving only red dots.

In the individual dot sections they are arranged in order of the themes receiving the most dots and within each theme the individual comments are arranged by those items receiving the most dots.

***Susan speaking here:** I know I don't get to talk, but when typing this section up two things came to me. One, (participants in the session) got to see these before they were reviewed by the people making the comments so you may be seeing things I misunderstood when taking notes. Two – I can tell from the categories that some of these are being placed in categories they do not belong in if you knew the context. I left them where they were, but am concerned a little.*

XV. Green/Yellow/Red Dots Combined (without any rank ordering)

- **Communication**
 - ✓ Keep up discussion – 6 green votes
- **Collaboration**
 - ✓ Make things a group or team effort – 1 green, 2 yellow
 - ✓ Balance interests of many diverse groups – 1 green
- **Innovation**
 - ✓ Green building – 1 green and 3 yellow
 - ✓ Video conferencing – 1 green 2 yellow
 - ✓ Create a core group to review alternatives, new technology and research from other groups – 4 green
- **Technology**
 - ✓ Single stream recycling – 2 green 2 yellow

- **Industry/Operations**
 - ✓ Broad scope to consider total cost, smart growth, green tier, fewer municipal landfills – 1 red, 4 green
 - ✓ More waste – 4 yellow
 - ✓ Land use issues – reclaim brown fields, expand rather than consume new green fields – 2 green, 1 yellow, 1 red
 - ✓ Consolidation haulers and landfills, expect more privatization – 3 red and 2 green
- **Communication**
 - ✓ Drafts of documents shared – 2 green , 1 red
 - ✓ Keep talking to stakeholder groups – 3 green
- **Organization**
 - ✓ Decentralization is generally working – local contacts are preferred in most cases – 5 red, 1 yellow
- **Costs**
 - ✓ Costs are reasonable – 3 red and 3 yellow
 - ✓ Be sure revenue collected is used for its intended purpose – 2 green 1 yellow
 - ✓ Stakeholders support fee increases, but expect better service – 1 green 2 yellow
 - ✓ Stop nibbling at the edges with the budget cuts. Need to cut some things so the rest of the program(s) have adequate resources – 2 green, 1 yellow
- **Regulation**
 - ✓ Targeted enforcement – focus on the bad guys. Spend less time with the good or average – 3 green, 3 yellow
 - ✓ Clear specific guidelines and rules – 2 green, 2 yellow, 1 red
 - ✓ Set standards and let business community find solutions – 2 red, 2 yellow
 - ✓ Don't force inspectors to find something bad, Minor things can be handled with a phone call many times – 4 yellow, 1 red
 - ✓ Get policy and implementation in line with each other – 3 green, 1 yellow
- **Culture**
 - ✓ Culture issue that needs to be addressed. It is not as simple as geographic or central office and regions. Conservatives and progressives – 6 yellow
- **Technology**
 - ✓ Use information technology to make their life easier and to ease burden on customers – 5 green

- **Change**
 - ✓ Need a change management program – 2 green, 3 yellow, 2 red
 - ✓ Meaningful general permits building towards self-certification – 7 red
 - ✓ Broaden their perspective to consider quality of life, financial health of 1 business, etc – 1 green, 2 yellow, and 1 red
 - ✓ Work with existing, and encourage other, voluntary beyond compliance programs – 1 green 2 yellow
 - ✓ Need to be open to new ideas and willing to accept research other than their own – 2 yellow, 1 green
 - ✓ Be open to new technology, alternative approaches and research done by others – 4 green, 2 yellow
 - ✓ Look at things on a macro level – on a big scale the program is successful – good environment, no people harmed and we can still site landfills – 2 green, 1 yellow
- **Professionalism**
 - ✓ Be predictable – helps business plan – 4 green, 2 yellow
 - ✓ Support staff – training – not only technical but from many perspectives, mentoring, need more staff, adequate funding for travel and training, let professional people behave professionally – 9 green
 - ✓ Supervisors need to manage their staff – 5 green
 - ✓ Keep to our timelines – 3 green
 - ✓ Keep doing outreach and targeted programs (recycling) 2 red, 2 green
 - ✓ Staff are professional, helpful – customer focused – 8 green
- **Service**
 - ✓ Make it easy to read, study or copy information (e.g. feasibility reports) does not have to be free – 3 green, 1 yellow, 1 red
- **Collaboration**
 - ✓ Develop partnerships. They do not have that many customers and most of those customers want to do the right thing. Working together we can get more done – 3 green, 1 yellow, 2 red
- **Communication**
 - ✓ Adopt a legislator – also need our stakeholders to say ‘DNR is doing a good job’ – 2 green, 2 yellow, 1 red
 - ✓ Public voice has been lost – or at least severely restricted – ex: Contested Case Hearing – two tracks and the public is cut out – 6 green, 1 red
- **Coordination**
 - ✓ Coordinate rules and regulations – 2 green, 1 yellow
 - ✓ Eliminate duplicate efforts both from one stage to another and between DNR staff and industry – 1 yellow, 5 red

XVI. Green Dot Prioritization (in rank order of total dots in category and highest ranking items within each category)

- **Professionalism (Total 31 dots)**

- 9 Support staff – training – not only technical but from many perspectives, mentoring, need more staff, adequate funding for travel and training, let professional people behave professionally
- 8 Staff are professional, helpful – customer focused
- 5 Supervisors need to manage their staff
- 4 Be predictable – helps business plan
- 3 Keep to our timelines
- 2 Keep doing outreach and targeted programs (recycling)

- **Communication (Total 19 dots)**

- 6 Keep up discussion
- 6 Public voice has been lost – or at least severely restricted – ex: Contested Case Hearing – two tracks and the public is cut out
- 3 Keep talking to stakeholder groups
- 2 Adopt a legislator – also need our stakeholders to say ‘DNR is doing A good job
- 2 Drafts of documents shared

- **Change (Total 11 dots)**

- 4 Be open to new technology, alternative approaches and research done by others
- 2 Look at things on a macro level – on a big scale the program is successful – good environment, no people harmed and we can still site landfills
- 2 Need a change management program
- 1 Broaden their perspective to consider quality of life, financial health of business, etc
- 1 Work with existing, and encourage other, voluntary beyond compliance programs
- 1 Need to be open to new ideas and willing to accept research other than their own

- **Industry/Operations (Total 8 dots)**

- 4 Broaden scope to consider total cost, smart growth, green tier
Fewer municipal landfills
- 2 Land use issues – reclaim brown fields, expand rather than consume new green fields
- 2 Consolidation of haulers and landfills, expect more privatization

- **Regulation (Total 8 dots)**

- 3 Targeted enforcement – focus on the bad guys. Spend less time with the good or average

- 2 Clear specific guidelines and rules
- 3 Get policy and implementation in line with each other
- **Innovation (Total 7 dots)**
 - 4 Create a core group to review alternatives, new technology and research from other groups
 - 1 Green building
 - 1 Video conferencing
- **Technology (Total 7 dots)**
 - 5 Use information technology to make their life easier and to ease burden on customers
 - 2 Single stream recycling
- **Costs (Total 5 dots)**
 - 2 Be sure revenue collected is used for its intended purpose
 - 2 Stop nibbling at the edges with the budget cuts. Need to cut some things so the rest of the program(s) have adequate resources
 - 1 Stakeholders support fee increases, but expect better service
- **Collaboration (Total 3 dots)**
 - 3 Develop partnerships. They do not have that many customers and most of those customers want to do the right thing. Working together we can get more done
 - 1 Make things a group or team effort
 - 1 Balance interests of many diverse groups
- **Service (Total 3 dots)**
 - 3 Make it easy to read, study or copy information (e.g. feasibility reports) does not have to be free
- **Coordination (Total 7 dots)**
 - 2 Coordinate rules and regulations

XVII Yellow Dot Prioritization (in order of total dots in category and highest ranking items within each category)

- **Change (Total 12 dots)**

- 3 Need a change management program
- 2 Broaden their perspective to consider quality of life, financial health of business, etc
- 2 Work with existing, and encourage other, voluntary beyond compliance programs
- 2 Need to be open to new ideas and willing to accept research other than their own
- 2 Be open to new technology, alternative approaches and research done by others
- 1 Look at things on a macro level – on a big scale the program is successful – good environment, no people harmed and we can still site

- **Regulation (Total 12 dots)**

- 4 Don't force inspectors to find something bad; Minor things can be handled with a phone call many times
- 3 Targeted enforcement – focus on the bad guys. Spend less time with the good or average
- 2 Clear specific guidelines and rules
- 2 Set standards and let business community find solutions
- 1 Get policy and implementation in line with each other

- **Costs (Total 7 dots)**

- 3 Costs are reasonable
- 2 Stakeholders support fee increases, but expect better service – 1 green 2 yellow
- 1 Stop nibbling at the edges with the budget cuts. Need to cut some things so the rest of the program(s) have adequate resources – 2 green, 1 yellow
- 1 Be sure revenue collected is used for its intended purpose

- **Innovation (Total 6 dots)**

- 2 Green building
- 2 Video conferencing

- **Industry/Operations (Total 5 dots)**

- 4 More waste
- 1 Land use issues – reclaim brown fields, expand rather than consume new green fields –

- **Collaboration (Total 4 dots)**
 - 3 Make things a group or team effort
 - 1 Develop partnerships. They do not have that many customers and most of those customers want to do the right thing. Working together we can get more done
- **Technology (Total 2 dots)**
 - 2 Single stream recycling
- **Communication (Total 2 dots)**
 - 2 Adopt a legislator – also need our stakeholders to say ‘DNR is doing a good job
- **Coordination (Total 2 dots)**
 - 1 Coordinate rules and regulations
 - 1 Eliminate duplicate efforts both from one stage to another and between DNR staff and industry
- **Professionalism (Total 2 dots)**
 - 2 Be predictable – helps business plan
- **Organization (Total 1 dot)**
 - 1 Decentralization is generally working – local contacts are preferred in most cases
- **Service (Total 1 dot)**
 - 1 Make it easy to read, study or copy information (e.g. feasibility reports) does not have to be free

XVIII. Red Dot Prioritization (in order of total dots in category and highest ranking items within each category)

- **Change (Total 10 dots)**

- 7 Meaningful general permits building towards self-certification
- 2 Need a change management program
- 1 Broaden their perspective to consider quality of life, financial health of business, etc

- **Industry/Operations (Total 5 dots)**

- 3 Consolidation of haulers and landfills, expect more privatization
- 1 Fewer municipal landfills
- 1 Land use issues – reclaim brown fields, expand rather than consume new green fields

- **Coordination (Total 5 dots)**

- 5 Eliminate duplicate efforts both from one stage to another and between DNR staff and industry

- **Organization (Total 5 dots)**

- 5 Decentralization is generally working – local contacts are preferred in most cases

- **Regulation (Total 5 dots)**

- 2 Set standards and let business community find solutions
- 1 Clear specific guidelines and rules
- 1 Don't force inspectors to find something bad; Minor things can be handled with a phone call many times

- **Communication (Total 3 dots)**

- 1 Adopt a legislator – also need our stakeholders to say 'DNR is doing a good job'
- 1 Public voice has been lost – or at least severely restricted – ex: Contested Case Hearing – two tracks and the public is cut out
- 1 Drafts of documents shared

- **Costs (Total 3 dots)**

- 3 Costs are reasonable

- **Professionalism (Total 2 dots)**

- 2 Keep doing outreach and targeted programs (recycling)

- **Collaboration (Total 2 dots)**

- 2 Develop partnerships. They do not have that many customers and most of those customers want to do the right thing. Working together we can get more done

- **Service (Total 1 dot)**

- 1 Make it easy to read, study or copy information (e.g. feasibility reports)
does not have to be free

XIX. **Suggested statutory changes:** The group suggested the following statutory changes that would enable the Waste Management program to be more effective:

- Siting process – cut time we end up spending on issues like site life, needs assessment, size – It would be more efficient to just pass a law to set a maximum landfill size and drop the needs assessment.
- Get rid of contested case hearings – would be a radical procedural change, but no significant change resulting in a better project has ever come from them. It would be better to make a policy that says all feasibility studies will have information hearings.
- Add an automatic compensatory calculation
- Keep things local – DNR would then not be involved
- Routinely set up an informational hearing to be in 3rd week of the 60 day comment period, to enable locals to learn more about the project and to comment on it.
- Landfill tipping fees in WI are too low – could raise with rule, but probably would be better to be statutory change
- Ban disposal of recyclables entirely – this would help reduce out of state waste
- Eliminate the fee exemption for daily cover – it is abused
- Set up a good career ladder and compensation package that recognizes expertise, productivity, etc. in DNR
- Plan review fees are too low and should be raised to reflect actual costs.
- Add late fees for late submittals of reports with predictable deadlines (e.g., annual reports) and/or for reviews of incomplete reports
- (Currently there is no accountability for annual reports being late. Such accountability would enable the Waste Management Program to be more effective.
- No control on landfill expansion size – set maximum landfill expansion size at say 5 million cubic yards
- The intent of WEPA isn't being met – there should be an EIS for these large landfill expansions – potentially call all sites proposed over 10 million cu. Yds ... A major action.

XX. Check-Out Round:

- Glad we changed the order – looking at the external comments worked OK.
- Technique does not lend itself to in-Department discussions.
- Learned a lot.
- Learned people are thinking the same things.
- Other issues need more discussion - especially on external comments.
- If staff does not trust redesign, nothing will happen.
- Dubious about sticking to the process.
- Last 30 minutes were good.
- Having time to discuss specific things with specific solutions would be better.
- Liked the changed order of things.
- Did not get to all the good ideas.
- Learned other perspectives.
- Did not get enough done.
- Reordering the agenda was a good thing.
- Large gulf between staff level and people making decisions.
- Large lack of trust.
- Emphasize the red dot – voting on the external comments – should show up as red flags – don't take industry comments as gospel.
- Did not get far enough. Will next staff group have a chance to review this information first and be able to build on it / progress further?
- Presented valid questions. What will other groups come up with? Will the design team actually use the input?
- Current management has lots of room for improvement - would like to see a participative management style – these meetings are a good starting point.
- Bigger picture things did not get discussed, but did at bureau meeting – go back and look at that.
- Big issue with out-of-state waste coming in to state.
- We work in microcosms and hope things come together.
- We should start with EVERYONE in the same room – these meetings seem like a divide and conquer technique.
- Would like to see a draft document from the design team that everyone in the program will have an opportunity to comment on before it is finalized and presented to management team.